```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                      MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
 2
                            NASHVILLE DIVISION
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 4
 5
                                        ) 3:17-CR-00032-1
         v.
                                        ) JUDGE RICHARDSON
 6
     JAMES FREI
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
         BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELI J. RICHARDSON, DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
                        TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                            CLOSING ARGUMENTS
15
                            February 14, 2019
16
17
                             TRIAL VOLUME 3-A
18
19
20
21
22
23
     DEBORAH K. WATSON, RPR, CRR, LCR
     Official Court Reporter
24
     801 Broadway, Room A837
     Nashville, TN 37203
25
     debbie watson@tnmd.uscourts.gov
```

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	For the Government:
4	MS. KATHRYN RISINGER MR. J. CHRISTOPHER SUEDEKUM
5	Assistant U.S. Attorney U.S. Attorney
6	Middle District of Tennessee 110 Ninth Avenue South
7	Suite A961 Nashville, TN 37203-3870
8	(615) 736-5151 katy.risinger@usdoj.gov
9	chris.suedekum@usdoj.gov
10	
11	For the Defendant:
12	MR. MICHAEL DAVID NOEL 40 Burton Hills Boulevard
13	Suite 200 Nashville, TN 37215
14	(615) 373-5597 mdnoel02@bellsouth.net
15	MR. CHARLES D. BUCKHOLTS
16	40 Burton Hills Boulevard Suite 200
17	Nashville, TN 37215 (615) 386-7118
18	chuck@buckholtslaw.com
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1		I	N	D	E	х	
2							Page
3	CLOSING ARGUMENTS						
4	By Ms. Risinger						4
5	By Mr. Buckholts By Ms. Risinger						17 27
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

The above-styled cause continued to be heard at 10:05 a.m. on February 14, 2019, before the Honorable Eli J. Richardson, District Judge, when the following proceedings were had, to-wit:

(Beginning of requested excerpt of closing arguments in the above-named case given on February 14, 2019.)

MS. RISINGER: Thank you, Your Honor, counsel.

May I have the screen, please?

"I am going to teach you everything I know about sex; and by the end of the summer, you are going to know more than your mom and your dad."

Those are the words that the Defendant, James

Frei, said to 15-year-old Taylor, and he said it within days

of messaging her on Facebook and before ever having met her.

Now, his intent, from the very first message, was crystal clear. This was about sex, pure and simple. It was about sex with 15-year-old Taylor. But he wasn't just going to have it; he was going to film it. He was going to photograph it. He was going to memorialize it with his cell phone. This is not a case of two teenagers in love. This is not a case of an adult consensual relationship.

There were no trips to the movies, to the Disney movies that 15-year-old Taylor loved. There were no fancy dinners at a restaurant in downtown Nashville. There was no courting phase. This relationship was pure manipulation by the Defendant, and it was that manipulative relationship through which he committed the eight crimes he is charged with.

Let's talk about those eight crimes and what they are. Counts 1 through 4 charged the Defendant with production of child pornography on four different dates: May 11th, May 17th, June 3rd, and June 5th. And what that means is the Defendant used or enticed a minor to engage in sexual activity for the purpose of producing an image and that the visual depiction or the image was produced using materials that had been shipped, mailed, or traveled, transported, imported for interstate commerce.

So what does that mean in the context of this case, why we're here today? What it means is that the Government had to prove -- and we did prove -- that the Defendant, James Frei, used or enticed 15- or 16-year-old Taylor to engage in sex and he produced images of it -- he produced those photos and those videos -- and that the photos and videos were produced using the Defendant's cell phone. Because as you heard in the stipulation, that cell phone was manufactured in China. So that cell phone was manufactured with materials that had been shipped or transported in

interstate commerce. So the images and videos on that cell phone meet that requirement.

But that stipulation isn't the only evidence of that. You also have the Defendant's transportation of that cell phone back and forth multiple times between here and North Carolina. That's also transporting in interstate commerce.

Count 5. This is sometimes referred to as online enticement of a minor or persuading a minor to engage in unlawful sexual activity.

Let me say one thing before I go a little further. The elements of each of these offenses, sometimes they'll say "illicit sexual activity" or "sexually explicit activity" or "unlawful sexual activity," and each of the charges you would get from the Judge will further define each of those terms.

But let me be very clear: The sex in this case with a 15-year-old from May 8th up until May 30th and then from May 30th through June 5th with a 16-year-old, it satisfies every definition of whether it's unlawful, sexually explicit, however the charge says it.

So what did the Government have to prove to show that he is guilty of Count 5? We have to prove that he enticed, induced, or persuaded an individual under the 18 -- age of 18 to engage in unlawful sexual activity, that he did so using a means or facility of interstate commerce, and that

the Defendant knew the individual was under 18.

So again, in the context of this case, to simplify it, what's that mean? It means the Defendant, James Frei, persuaded, induced, or enticed 15-, 16-year-old Taylor to engage in sex, that he used his cell phone or the Internet to entice and induce her. That will be in the instructions: a cell phone and the Internet or facilities of interstate commerce. And through the Internet in this case, that's Facebook. And third, that he knew -- which he did -- that Taylor was underage, that she was 15 or 16.

Counts 6 and 7, traveling with the intent to engage in sexual activity. What that means is that when the Defendant traveled from North Carolina -- well, let me stop. What that means is that the Defendant had to travel in interstate commerce on or about the dates alleged in those counts, and that he did so with the intent to engage in sexual conduct.

So in the context of this case, that means James Frei traveled from another state -- North Carolina or anywhere else outside of Tennessee -- to Tennessee on or around the dates alleged, and that when he did so, when he traveled, he intended to have sex with 15- or 16-year-old Taylor.

And the last count -- there's no Count 8., so just to not confuse you when you get back there, there's no

Count 8.

The last count, Count 9, is transporting child pornography, and that is that the Defendant knowingly transported in interstate commerce items or items of child pornography, and that when he transported those items, he believed that they were child pornography.

In the context of this case, James Frei knowingly transported the images and videos he took of 15-, 16-year-old Taylor across state lines and that when he transported those photos, he believed them to be child pornography. He knew them to be child pornography.

From the moment James Frei met Taylor on Facebook, he began grooming her. You heard her testify at the time, she was an inexperienced and impressionable young girl, and at that particular time in May 2016, she was especially vulnerable. And she was vulnerable because the people she thought were her friends, her high school friends, were bullying her. And they were doing it because she has, of all things, diabetes, and would have to miss school.

So her friends were making fun of her, and she became withdrawn, she became depressed. And so what did she do? Well, she tried to rectify the situation. She picked herself up, and she thought, "I'll join a Facebook group for teens. And maybe through that group, I'll find some friends. I'll find some friends that won't bully me because of my

medical condition."

And it was through that group, that Facebook teen group, that the Defendant, 47-year-old James Frei, found Taylor and began preying on her. And from that moment on, from the very first message on May 3rd, 2016, he began setting the stage. He complimented her, called her sexy. That was the very first message. Told her she looked cute, that he loved her smile.

When he was saying those things, there's no doubt that he knew her age, because in the first message she sent him, she told him she was 15, almost 16. Well, let's just say he forgot that message. Well, that wasn't the only time they talked about it. In fact, when she sent him a photo of her in a blue dress and said it was from Easter of the year, he had the audacity to say, "You don't look 15 in that photo. You actually look 13 or 14. But hey, I mean that in a good way. That's a good thing. Because I don't care if you were 13 or 14."

That's what the Defendant said to Taylor.

Now, he asked her for pictures, and he did that pretty quickly. And at first he eased into it, right? He asked her for some pictures of her dressed. But then he escalated it. He started asking, "Wish you could send a bra and panty pic."

Well, what he really wanted, what he really loved,

were nudes. Would she send a nude pic? "Could we do some cam to cam at night?" And when she said she didn't have those pics and she didn't have the camera, he said, "Well, that's okay. Can I take pics tomorrow?"

He suggested visiting her. That was his suggestion, to travel to Nashville from North Carolina. But he knew he had to plan how to do this. He couldn't just show up at her apartment one day when her dad was home and her 12-year-old brother was playing Xbox or whatever 12-year-olds do. So he had to plan. And he started doing that with her. "What time will your dad be home? Is your dad gone?"

And then that went to, "Do you have a building?

Do you have a big backyard? Do you have a building in your backyard?"

I mean, I guess the Defendant was planning to take 15-year-old Taylor, a virgin, and bang her in the toolshed next to a lawn mower if he could. But she lived in an apartment, so that wasn't going to work.

So what about a park? Maybe a park. And he thought, "Well, there might be a few too many people, but maybe a park would work."

And finally the Defendant had an idea. What about a friend? "Do you have a friend who would cover for you, a friend who you can say you were going to spend the night with when in reality, you come and stay

with me at a hotel?"

Planning how to sneak around and how not to get caught, that is manipulation at its best. That is conniving. That is evidence of the Defendant's intent to travel and engage in sex with 15-year-old Taylor when he got here.

He asked her personal questions. He asked her about her period. He asked her if she masturbated, asked her if she wanted him to masturbate. And then -- and then he sent incredibly graphic messages to a 15-year-old girl about everything he wanted to do to her.

Now he started -- he started soft. He said, you know, "I believe a woman's first time should be made love to." I guess in that toolshed or the park.

Then it escalated. It escalated quickly. And you can see it on the screen. You heard it yesterday. I'm not going to go through those messages again. We went through a select few of the approximately 2,000 messages, maybe 150 of them, in detail yesterday. And I suspect that you've seen and heard enough of those messages so I'm not going to do that here today in court.

But if I'm wrong, if I'm wrong and one of you gets back to the jury and you think, "You know what? The Government only showed us 150 messages. Maybe somehow the other 1,850 messages would make a difference," they're not different, but they're in evidence. So if you're wondering

about that, go back, look at them. That's Government's

Exhibit 6B. It is 300-plus pages of messages between the

Defendant and 15-year-old Taylor. It is a play-by-play book
on how to entice and induce a kid into engaging in sex. Go

look at it.

So May 8th comes around. Five days, about 700 messages in, and the Defendant travels to Nashville. And on May 8th at 6:10 a.m. -- you can see it in the chats, in the summary chart, Government's Exhibit 6A; or in the underlying chats, 6B, you can see it. At 6:10, he's at her apartment.

But it's not just in the chats, in case you were worried those may be wrong. You can look at his bank statement. You might have been asking yourself why Mr. Oliver was testifying at trial. Mr. Oliver was talking about the bank statements, pointing out the dates that the Defendant was making transactions with his bank card in Nashville.

So after the Defendant, James Frei, traveled five or six hours through the dark of night from North Carolina to Nashville, he arrived in Nashville with the hopes of engaging in a carnival of sex. He wanted a little bit of everything: a little vaginal, a little oral, and a little anal. But he just didn't want it. He wanted to film it, he wanted to photograph it, he wanted to document it. He used Taylor, 15-year-old Taylor, to engage in sex for the purpose of

producing those photos and videos.

And on May 8th, he took six photos and three videos. And yesterday we didn't go through every single photo of Taylor on his phone in a sexually provocative position. We didn't watch the videos in full. We saw a few seconds, we looked at a few photos: six photos, three videos from that first trip. The best part of those videos that we watched on that TV screen in court yesterday, though, was that one video from May 8th where the Defendant's camera, his phone camera, panned right past his face as he went to focus on Taylor and what she was doing. The Defendant took those videos.

When he was done with her, dropped her off, headed back to North Carolina. Wasn't the end of it, though. Did not stop there.

On May 9th, as soon as he gets back to

North Carolina, he starts it up again. He's doing that
grooming process. But now we've engaged in all types of
things, so maybe we'll suggest something a little different.

Maybe he'll buy her a dog collar. Maybe he'll walk her
around on a leash. Sure, why not. Why not throw that out
there, a little S and M, a little dominance, submissive, some
bondage. Why not, Taylor? She's 15.

She doesn't even know what that means. She told you that. Half these messages she received, she went with

it. Her responses are, okay, yeah, smiley face. She doesn't say, "Yeah, I'd love to get on all fours and you drag me around in a store by a leash and a dog collar." That's not her response. She doesn't even understand these things.

But the Defendant can't get there for another nine days. So what's he do to tide himself over in the meantime? In addition to messaging her, he watches those videos, those videos from May 8th. We know he watched those videos at least three times because we have screenshots on them. We have one screenshot from May 11th and two screenshots from May 16th. And Detective Gish told you when he was watching those videos, he hit a combination of buttons and he took a screenshot. He must have really liked what was happening in the video at that particular moment with that particular image upon his phone.

Comes over next time on May 17th. Again, under the cloak of darkness, he travels from North Carolina to Nashville, Tennessee. Gets there just a little after midnight, but he doesn't see her right after midnight. It's really not possible. Her dad's home overnight but he leaves early because he's a manager at a gas station.

So he's at her door at 5:13 a.m. But again, you don't have to believe. Just the chats. Look at his bank records. Look at those transactions that occurred in Nashville.

And on May 8th -- I'm sorry -- May 17th, as soon as he got to her apartment at 5:13 a.m., he again engaged in sexual activity with her and he filmed it. What was Taylor wearing? She was wearing her purple nightgown with butterflies, the nightgown of a 15-year-old kid. That's what she had on in that video. Not what the Defendant wanted her to wear, not the kind of outfit the Defendant sent her a picture of asking if she'd like that. And then in the chats he clarified, well, did she like blond hair or did she like the girl? That's what he said to 15-year-old Taylor when he sent her that photo.

Now, after May 17th, just a few more trips scattered in there. Taylor says she does not recall a trip where they didn't have sex. But I want to fast-forward to her birthday weekend. She turned 16 on May 30th. And on June 3rd through June 6th, that was her birthday weekend. She was going to be having a party. And the Defendant -- although 16, she's still a minor, she's still impressionable -- Defendant travels, once again, to Nashville.

But this time, he gets a hotel, and he's going to stay until Monday morning, stay at least three days. And on June 3rd, he arrives. He eventually comes and picks her up from her apartment and he takes her back to his hotel, and he takes ten photographs of Taylor in sexually provocative

positions standing in the bathroom area of his hotel room.

And we looked at one of those images. We looked at the image, 7E-21, that's cropped on the screen for you here. There was more to that image. Go back and look at it. But it's the Defendant and Taylor naked, and the Defendant's holding that cell phone, that LG L33L, and he's taking a selfie of the two of them in the mirror.

back to his hotel, and it's on that occasion that he takes four of the most up close and personal images of her: one photo and three bursts, up close and personal, of her vagina. She told you she didn't remember him specifically taking those photos but that she looked at them prior to coming into court, and she believed those to be photos of her. And they even had the mole that 15-year-old -- well, at that time 16-year-old Taylor had at the top of her leg. Fits with the timeline. When those photos were taken on her phone, he was in Nashville at the Motel 6.

Now, thanks to Facebook and their cyber tip, those were the last photos that the Defendant was able to produce of 15-, 16-year-old Taylor.

You might have been asking yourself during this trial how in the world a 15-year-old fell prey to the Defendant. She's going through a rough time and she thought he cared about her. So to her, this relationship, if you

```
want to call it that, as odd as it may be to any of us sitting in this courtroom, it filled a void for her. But to him, to the Defendant, James Frei, it was all about his master plan to turn Taylor into what he needed her to be to satisfy his sexual desires. Sex that she was too young to legally consent to.
```

He complimented her, told her he loved her, he told her he missed her. And he introduced her -- he told her he would buy her things. And he introduced her to a 50 Shades of Grey kind of world, a world that Taylor did not fully comprehend and a world that she likely didn't even know existed on May 3rd, 2016, when she responded to his first message: "Oh, my God. So sexy. How old?"

He is guilty. Find him guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Risinger.

Mr. Buckholts?

MR. BUCKHOLTS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Thank you for your service and listening to this case. Mr. Frei thanks you for listening to this case.

I wanted first to go back and talk about at the very beginning of the trial. We talked about the elements of each and every count, the burden of the Government to prove each and every count beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, the Judge is going to instruct you on what the law is. He's going to give you that instruction in just

a little bit. I ask that you pay careful attention to the instructions that you receive and all of the instructions in full, that you don't gloss over anything, that you go back and you look at each and every element, you consider the evidence that you've heard in this case, and you consider everything before you reach a verdict.

I want to start out, I'm going to talk about, really, two main things in this case. I want to talk about the relationship with Mr. Frei, between Mr. Frei and Ms. Bushong and how the Government's characterized it. And then I want to talk about, after that, I'm going to go through the elements of Counts 1 through 4 very carefully with each and every one of you. I'm going to talk about that.

Now, the Government has portrayed this relationship as -- in a different way, as Taylor Bushong being impressionable. I think all 15-year-olds, 15-, 16-year-olds, that's true to a certain extent. But they portrayed it almost as if she was drug in kicking and screaming into this action.

If you look at the first couple of pages of the government's exhibit -- when you're going to go back, you'll have the Facebook messages -- this was pretty much, right from the start, an agreement to engage in a sexual relationship from the beginning. That doesn't make it right,

it doesn't make it good. There are elements of other counts in this indictment that address those things. But to -- I'm not going to get an opportunity to talk to you again, so I'm going to make sure I go through some of these things as to the relationship aspect of it.

One of the things about this, the Government mentioned the pure volume of these Facebook chats, and there are a lot. There are a bunch of them. If you go through those, there are going to be hearts back and forth to each other. There was -- as they get later in time, there is more expressions between the two of them of affection. There are discussions of gifts.

There was some testimony Ms. Bushong couldn't remember, had to be reminded on certain things, said she had -- what I recall what she said at first was that she thought every trip was -- there was sexual activity, and then she couldn't remember.

Some of those things, I think you have to use your common sense and reason to determine, you know, would you remember that or not? Would you remember whether you had a sexual encounter or not? I know it's been two years, but that's a pretty significant event in somebody's life, and so I don't believe it's entirely accurate.

And if you look at the context of the Facebook messages, for anybody to say that there wasn't some affection

between both Ms. Bushong and Mr. Frei, obviously, there's a difference in the two parties as to influence and impressionability. But to characterize it, Ms. Bushong is just being so reluctant that she was almost forced into this relationship, I know that the Government didn't go that far, but it went pretty far to say that she was -- she was very willing, you can tell, from the Facebook chats right away.

So that gets us into Counts 1 through 4, and I posted those up there for you. Hopefully they're big enough. You're going to get these again back when you're able to go. The Judge is going to instruct you, but I want to walk through those things with you.

You've got the four counts with the four dates.

You've got the May 8th, the May 17, the June 3rd, and the

June 6th events. And if you look at count -- at the count,

you've got A and B; you've got a first and a second there.

Now, the second element there is not in dispute. Whether the

visual depictions -- you've seen evidence of visual

depictions. There's no question about that. They traveled

across state lines. You've heard testimony about that.

There's no dispute on that.

But what there is a dispute is, is that the

Defendant employed, used, persuaded, induced, enticed, or

coerced Taylor Bushong to engage in sexually explicit

conduct. And I bolded for the purpose of producing a visual

depiction.

Now, the Government would have you believe that you have to find, well, they had sex and there was a video created, so it must have been for the purpose of creating the video. That must have been the purpose of the sexual act.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would contend to you that the sexual acts were for the purposes of having sex. This was not a situation where you had, you know, a camera crew and you had a hidden camera somewhere and where a Defendant may have taken photographs or videos or had something hidden. This was out in the open with knowledge as far as the -- as far as the photographs. So those would suggest that the sexual relationship wasn't for the purpose of the photographs.

Now, let me give you some -- you need to use your common sense and reason when you go back in the deliberation room. When you go back there -- and I'm going to give you some examples of how to think about photographs and events where you take photographs. Now, some of you may have family members that play in sports. Some of you may have played sports. And you had a sporting event, maybe it was a football game, and maybe you asked somebody to come out there and take the photographs of your football game or your basketball or whatever sporting event it is. And so they took pictures.

Now, the purpose of the photograph, as the Government said, would be to memorialize the event. But it wouldn't be -- the football game itself, the activity, is not for the purpose of -- you're not doing the act so that you can create or have a photograph of it. It's a memorialization of an event.

And it would be the same if you had any major event in life. A lot of people, if they get married, will have photographs taken of their -- of the events at their wedding. You wouldn't say, "Well, they had the wedding for the purpose of creating a visual image of the wedding."

So if you look at the statute and what it says for the purpose of producing the visual depiction, now you may say to yourself, "Well, what could be some times where you would have a photograph or a video or you would do an action for the purpose of creating a video or photograph of that event?"

Well, we can think, in the social media age, of a lot of different things. I'll give you a couple of examples. Whenever there's a movie that you go see at the movies or you watch a video, that's clearly one where the actions on the video are for the purposes of creating the video. Another would be fashion magazines, people posing and -- in a certain magazine, would be for the purpose of creating the visual depiction so that you sell advertisements, things like that.

Another one would be maybe you wanted to -- you were trying to sell a vehicle, and so you clean your car up and then you take photographs of it so you can put it online and try to sell it. Those would be some examples of clearly a photograph -- you know, the events that are depicted being for the purpose of producing a visual depiction, a video.

Now, this situation is different in this respect.

Unfortunately -- of course, not excusing the conduct;

nobody's here to argue anything about excusing the conduct.

But frankly, the facts of this case, if you look at the facts, you look at the context of what was going on here, this was a sexual relationship for the purpose of having -- the sex acts were for the purpose of having sex. And that's what it is.

There were videos created, but that doesn't mean that if -- and this would be hypothetically, but I think you might be able to draw inferences from this. I think if you go back and you look at the conversations that Ms. Bushong and Mr. Frei had, they're talking about sex in a whole lot of them, in most of them. But they also, during that time, talk -- they do talk about some other things as the relationship, you know, gets further down in time. It's going to start out in early May and it goes to July 10th. And so you have some changes as it goes on.

Even early on in the -- for instance, Ms. Bushong,

I believe it's on page 45, roundabout there, she talks about where she's not wanting to go to school. And Mr. Frei responds, well, he doesn't want to go to work either but he's good to go. He's got to go. I think it was GTG. So they discuss other things in there. They do discuss things. They talk about affection.

And again, that's not right and there are a bunch of other counts and you may very well look at the evidence. For instance, the travel in interstate commerce for the purposes of having sex with a minor, you may very well find that the Government has met its burden of proof on those facts and the elements of those counts.

But on these counts, you can't find that. You can't -- the circumstantial evidence does not weigh in the favor of the Government on those. The Judge talked about circumstantial evidence, and I would say in this case there's -- really, this would be a circumstantial evidence case. You can't -- obviously, nobody can read anybody's mind, so it always makes it difficult to figure out what somebody's intent, why they do something. So when we started out, we talked about the what, where, when -- who, what, when, and where, and then the why.

And so the Government is saying, well, look at the entire relationship. They took the photographs; must have been for the purpose of the photographs. That's the

implication.

Now, when the Judge talked about circumstantial evidence, he gave an example of if it's raining outside. And circumstantial evidence would be a person walks into the courtroom, they sit down there at the witness stand, they have an umbrella, and it's wet. That would be circumstantial evidence that the jury could draw inferences that it's probably raining outside.

It's not always that clear-cut when it comes to circumstantial evidence. I would give -- what if a person came in with an umbrella and they walked in and they sat there at the witness stand but it wasn't wet. So you have, well, there might be a suggestion that it might be raining, but this person might just carry their umbrella around everywhere they go.

Obviously, direct evidence, the Judge said, would be if somebody said, "Hey, it's raining outside," and that was the testimony you heard. Well, you don't have any witness obviously for direct evidence, you know. You don't have any evidence that says that the sexually explicit conduct, the sex acts, were for the purpose of producing a photograph. You don't have any officers saying that. You don't even have Ms. Bushong saying that.

So that leads us to the circumstantial evidence in the case. And so what you have to look at in determining

whether the photographs and videos or the sexual conduct was for the purpose of producing the visual depiction is, you have to look at the entire case. You have to use your commonsense reason.

And it's Mr. Frei's contention -- and the evidence supports this -- that as improper as you find it, as morally repugnant, that those sexual acts were not for the purpose of producing the photos or the videos.

So for that reason, on Counts 1 through 4, there is just not sufficient evidence. The Government has a burden of proof to find each and every element of Counts 1 through 4 beyond a reasonable doubt. And if you go back and you look at the heart emojis and all of the things in there relationship-wise, and also consider the fact that these Facebook messaging back and forth continued on even after the sexual acts in the photographs were taken. I kind of think you could also look at it in a way: If this were for the purpose of creating the photographs for visual images, well, that was done the first day, but the relationship continued.

The bottom line is, Ms. Bushong and Mr. Frei were having sex for the purpose of having sex. It wasn't to create a video, it wasn't to create a photograph. And so, therefore, on Counts 1 through 4, I ask that you return a verdict of not guilty.

Now, on the other counts, you may find that there

is sufficient evidence on those. Go back and review those counts, and if you -- there very well could be counts that you find that there is sufficient evidence. But on these four counts, you should not -- you should render a verdict of not guilty on that.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I thank you for your service. And thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Buckholts.

Ms. Risinger?

1.3

MS. RISINGER: Let me be clear: He does not have to use Taylor to engage in sexual activity for the purpose -- for the sole purpose of producing child pornography; rather, that has to be a purpose. It's not mutually exclusive. He can want to have sex with her, he can enjoy the sex with her, and he can also use her to engage in that sex for the purpose of producing child pornography. It does not have to be a sole purpose and it doesn't have to be premeditated.

Doesn't have to be thinking about it when he's back in North Carolina, although there's evidence he was when he was talking about "Can I take photos." He's asking her if she's ever seen a porno, would she want him to bring a sex movie for them to watch.

The production value of those videos, whether there were big lights and camera and sexy scenes, also doesn't matter. These videos and these photos weren't being

produced so they could end up on Pornhub; they were being produced so the Defendant could go back and watch them over and over and over. Circumstantial evidence that he used Taylor to engage in sexually explicit activity for the purpose of producing images and movies: the number of photos and videos. Every image of Taylor that was taken with his phone revolved around sex. The only three clothed pictures recovered from his phone of Taylor were downloaded from Facebook or received. Every single photo and video he took with his phone, the number, the sheer number of those, 27, that's circumstantial evidence.

The instruction he would give her during the videos, you heard a little bit of it when we played one of those videos for a few seconds, but you also heard Detective Gish talk about what he would hear when he watched and listened to the full video. You heard her tell you sometimes he'd say, "Smile" in the videos. "Open your mouth. We need to get you over this shyness."

In that video from May 17th when he pulls down her nightgown and pants to her face, and she clearly hunches other and puts her arms over her exposed breasts and her head down, "We need to get you over that shyness," his instructions.

How he would adjust the camera during the videos, panning from one part of Taylor's body to another. That's

circumstantial evidence. His retention of the photos and videos, the fact that he still had them when Detective Adkins seized his phone on our search, you heard Detective Gish tell you those weren't deleted. And we know -- we know he watched them; we know he looked at them. It doesn't have to be the sole purpose, just a purpose. You're not missing anything. Don't overthink this. Like my co-counsel, Mr. Suedekum, told you in opening, the evidence in this case is overwhelming. He is guilty. Find him guilty. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Risinger. (End of excerpt. Proceedings occurring after this excerpt included in Trial Volume 3.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Deborah K. Watson, Official Court Reporter for
4	the United States District Court for the Middle District of
5	Tennessee, with offices at Nashville, do hereby certify:
6	That I reported on the stenotype shorthand machine
7	the proceedings held in open court on February 14, 2019, in
8	the matter of <i>United States of America vs. James Frei</i> , Case
9	No. 3:17-cr-00032;
10	That an excerpt of proceedings in connection with
11	the hearing was reduced to typewritten form by me;
12	That the foregoing transcript (pages 1 through 29)
13	is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best
14	of my skills and abilities;
15	This the 1st day of September, 2020.
16	
17	/s/ Deborah K. Watson DEBORAH K. WATSON, RPR, CRR
18	Official Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	